

pre



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,183	07/13/2000	Vincent H. Curley	MSFT115462	3712

26389 7590 06/16/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC  
 1420 FIFTH AVENUE  
 SUITE 2800  
 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

172

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/615,183	Applicant(s) CURLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip B Tran	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 16-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rich et al (Hereafter, Rich), U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,065.

Regarding claim 1, Rich teaches a method of optimizing the synchronization of data between a client computer having a client database and a server computer having a server database (i.e., optimization for replication of objects between a client node having client database and server node having server database) [see Col. 2, Line 45 - Col. 3, Line 3], comprising :

communicating a plurality of database items (= data objects) from the client computer to the server computer, wherein the plurality of database items (= data objects) includes a parent database item (i.e., distributed computer systems form

networks of nodes where each node may act as both a client and a server to the other nodes and data objects include parent/child/grandchild or successor objects) [see Col. 8, Lines 63-65 and Col. 9, Lines 5-67] ;

determining if a received parent database item (= parent object) is improperly received, wherein the determination of an improperly received parent database item (= parent object) is based upon the detection of a data transfer error associated with the parent database item (= parent object) (i.e., distributing objects between nodes and determining whether committing the modifications to replicated objects will result in an unacceptable data conflict) [see Abstract and Col. 4, Lines 25-48]. Note that, data object include parent/child objects; and

selectively communicating a child database item (= child object) associated with the parent database item (= parent object) from the client computer to the server computer, only if no data transfer error was detected with respect to the parent database item (= parent object) (i.e., if no unacceptable data conflict will occur, then the modifications to replicated objects are committed with respect to parent/child/grandchild or successor object relationship) [see Abstract and Figs. 4A-4B and Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 10, Lines 11-41 and Col. 11, Lines 20-67]; and

synchronizing the communicated child database item (= child object) with a corresponding child database item (= child object) stored on the server computer (i.e., optimization for replication of objects between a client node having client database and server node having server database [see Col. 2, Line 45 - Col. 3, Line 3] wherein child

object (473) is in synchronized communication with corresponding child object (471) [see Fig. 4B and Col. 11, Lines 20-35]).

Regarding claim 2, claim 2 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1. In addition, Rich further teaches assigning a status code to the parent object received at the server computer (i.e., version status of the object) [see Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 12, Lines 33-41 and Col. 16, Lines 56-65]. Note that, data object include parent/child objects.

Regarding claim 3, Rich further teaches the status code is assigned by the server computer [see Col. 12, Lines 20-26].

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2. In addition, Rich further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the object hierarchy further comprises at least one grandchild object associated with the at least one child object and the at least one parent object, the method further comprising assigning a child status code to child objects associated with the parent object received at the server computer (i.e., version status of the object) [see Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 12, Lines 20-26 and Col. 12, Lines 33-41 and Col. 16, Lines 56-65], the child status code being based upon the detection or non-detection of a data transfer error associated with the child objects, updating a status code of grandchild objects associated with child objects associated with the parent object, the updated status code

of the grandchild objects associated with a child object associated with the parent object being based on the child status codes and selectively communicating grandchild objects associated the child object associated with the parent object from the client computer to the server computer, wherein grandchild objects associated with a child object associated the parent object are communicated if the status code of the grand child objects indicate a non-detection of a data transfer error associated with the child object [see Fig. 4A and Col. 11, Line 15 - Col. 12, Line 41]. Note that, data object include parent/child/grandchild or successor objects [see Fig. 4A].

Claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 3.

Claim 11 discloses a computer-readable medium containing computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, perform the method of any one of claims 2-10. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 2-10.

Claim 12 discloses a computer-controlled apparatus for performing the method of any one of claims 2-10. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 2-10.

Claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Claim 16 discloses a computer-readable medium containing computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, perform the method of any one of claims 13-15. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 13-15.

Claim 17 discloses a computer-controlled apparatus for performing the method of any one of claims 13-15. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 13-15.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Claim 21 discloses a computer-readable medium containing computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, perform the method of any one of claims 18-20. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 18-20.

Claim 22 discloses a computer-controlled apparatus for performing the method of any one of claims 18-20. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to any one of claims 18-20.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 4-8, 14-15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rich et al (Hereafter, Rich), U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,065 in view of Nori et al (Hereafter, Nori), U.S. Pat. No. 6,108,664.

Regarding claims 4-5, Rich does not explicitly teach the server assigns ID to the database item (= data object). However, Rich does suggest the sever assigns status code such as version status of the objects as disclosed above in claim 3 [see Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 12, Lines 20-26 and Col. 12, Lines 33-41 and Col. 16, Lines 56-65]. Nori, in the same field of data objects distribution in the database, discloses the concept of object ID assigned by the server [see Abstract and Col. 8, Lines 53-60]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to assign ID to data objects in order to distinguish different types of data objects.



Regarding claim 6, Rich does not explicitly teach updating ID of the database item (= data object). However, Rich does suggest replication or updating the data object and the child data object [see Col. 11, Line 15 - Col. 12, Line 41]. Nori, in the same field of data objects distribution in the database, discloses the concept of object ID assigned by the server [see Abstract and Col. 8, Lines 53-60 and Col. 13, Lines 13-20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to assign ID to data objects and updating objects ID because it would have enable to distinguish different types of data objects and thus synchronize objects in the two databases.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 4-5

Claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 6.

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 7.

Claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 4-5.

Claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 7.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons :

In response to applicants' arguments, the law of anticipation requires that a distinction be made between the invention described or taught and the invention claimed. It does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches.

Assuming that a reference is properly "prior art," it is only necessary that the claims under consideration "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or "fully met" by it. See ***Colman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 218 USPO 789.**

Rich teaches a method of optimizing the synchronization of data between a client computer having a client database and a server computer having a server database. That is, optimization for replication of objects between a client node having client database and server node having server database [see Col. 2, Line 45 - Col. 3, Line 3], comprising communicating a plurality of database items (= data objects) from the client computer to the server computer, wherein the plurality of database items (= data objects) includes a parent database item (= parent object). For example, distributed computer systems form networks of nodes where each node may act as both a client and a server to the other nodes and data objects include parent/child objects [see Col. 8, Lines 63-65 and Col. 9, Lines 5-67].

In addition, Rich further teaches determining if a received parent object is improperly received, wherein the determination of an improperly received parent database item (= parent object) is based upon the detection of a data transfer error associated with the parent database item (= parent object). That is, distributing objects between nodes and determining whether committing the modifications to replicated objects will result in an unacceptable data conflict [see Abstract and Col. 4, Lines 25-48]. Note that, data object include parent/child/grandchild/successor objects. Moreover, Rich teaches selectively communicating a child database item (= child object)

associated with the parent database item (= parent object) from the client computer to the server computer, only if no data transfer error was detected with respect to the parent database item (= parent object). For example, if no unacceptable data conflict will occur, then the modifications to replicated objects are committed with respect to parent object/child object/grandchild/successor relationship [see Abstract and Figs. 4A-4B and Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 10, Lines 11-41 and Col. 11, Lines 20-67].

Furthermore, Rich teaches synchronizing the communicated child database item (= child object) with a corresponding child database item (= child object) stored on the server computer. That is, optimization for replication of objects between a client node having client database and server node having server database [see Col. 2, Line 45 - Col. 3, Line 3] wherein child object (473) is in synchronized communication with corresponding child object (471) [see Fig. 4B and Col. 11, Lines 20-35]. Also, Rich does suggest the sever assigns status code such as version status of the objects [see Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 12, Lines 20-26 and Col. 12, Lines 33-41 and Col. 16, Lines 56-65].

Note that the distributed computer systems, in Rich, form networks of nodes where each node may act as both a client and a server to the other nodes and data objects tree includes parent/child/grandchild/successor relationships [see Fig. 4A and Col. 8, Lines 63-65 and Col. 9, Lines 5-67 and Col. 10, Lines 11-41 and Col. 11, Lines 20-67].

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 does not even mention synchronizing the communicated child database item (= child object) with a corresponding child database

item (= child object) stored on the server computer as recited in claims 1-2. However, Rich still does disclose this feature as rejected in claims 1-2.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant obviously attacks references individually without taking into consideration based on the teaching of combinations of references as shown in the following section of 35 USC § 103 rejection. Rich does suggest the sever assigns status code such as version status of the objects [see Col. 4, Lines 55-64 and Col. 12, Lines 20-26 and Col. 12, Lines 33-41 and Col. 16, Lines 56-65]. Nori, in the same field of data objects distribution in the database, discloses the concept of object ID assigned by the server [see Abstract and Col. 8, Lines 53-60 and Col. 13, Lines 13-20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to assign ID to data objects and updating objects ID because it would have enable to distinguish different types of data objects and thus synchronize objects in the two databases.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that the cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims. Claims 3-12, 14-17 and 19-22 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth below. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-22 are respectfully maintained.

***Other References Cited***

6. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Kloba et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,316.

B) Gates et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0049579.

7. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS, OR THIRTY DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-8767. The Group fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached on (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

*Philip Tran*  
Philip B. Tran  
Art Unit 2155  
June 09, 2004